

Application Serial No: 10/644,574
In reply to Office Action of 29 July 2004

Attorney Docket No. 83046

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-11 are currently pending in the application. No claims are allowed. Claims 1-4, 8 and 11 are rejected and claims 5-7, 9 and 10 are objected to. Claims 1, 6, 8 and 10 are amended by this response. Claims 5 and 9 are cancelled without prejudice.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4, 8 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gatemen (Reference N: WO91/13373) in combination with Ngoi et al (Reference B: U.S. Patent No. 6,320,665).

With regard to claim 2, the Examiner contended that the Gateman reference discloses the utilization of a laser (8).

With regard to claims 3 and 11, the Examiner contended that the Ngoi et al. reference discloses the utilization of a beam splitter (17).

With regard to claim 4, the Examiner contended that the Ngoi et al. reference discloses the utilization of a laser Doppler vibrometer (see column 1, lines 17-21).

The Examiner has objected to claims 5-7, 9 and 10 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but he indicated that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Application Serial No: 10/644,574
In reply to Office Action of 29 July 2004

Attorney Docket No. 83046

These rejections and objections are respectfully traversed in view of these amendments and remarks.

Applicants have amended claim 1 by incorporating the limitations of claim 5 therein. It is suggested that this has the same effect as writing claim 5 in independent form in strict compliance with the Examiner's requirements for allowance. Claims 2-4 should be allowable by dependency. Claim 5 has been cancelled without prejudice as being redundant. Claim 6 has been amended to change its dependency from claim 5 to claim 1. Claims 6-7 should also be allowable by dependency. In view of these amendments, Applicants respectfully solicit reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-4 and 6-7.

Applicants have amended claim 8 by incorporating the limitations of claim 9 therein. Claim 8 should now have the same scope as claim 9 which the Examiner has indicated as being allowable. Claim 9 has been cancelled without prejudice as being redundant. Claim 10 has been amended to change its dependency from claim 9 to claim 8. Claims 10-11 should be allowable by dependency. In view of these amendments, Applicants respectfully solicit reconsideration and allowance of claims 8 and 10-11. Applicants view all of the claims currently in the case as allowable and request allowance of the remaining claims and the application.


Application Serial No: 10/644,574
In reply to Office Action of 29 July 2004

Attorney Docket No. 83046

The Examiner is invited to telephone James M. Kasischke, Attorney for Applicants, at 401-832-4736 if, in the opinion of the Examiner, such a telephone call would serve to expedite the prosecution of the subject patent application.

Respectfully submitted,
FLETCHER A. BLACKMON ET AL

25 October 2004

By 
JAMES M. KASISCHKE
Attorney of Record
Reg. No. 36562